

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JASON ADAM JENSEN,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITIBANK, N.A., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 6:22-CV-03140-BCW

Honorable Judge Wimes Presiding

**PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS AND MEMORANDUM ON TODAY'S DEADLINE, MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
AMENDED TRIAL ORDER**

COMESNOW, Plaintiff, Jason A Jensen ("JENSEN"), under equity.


JENSEN, from hereon will speak first person until wherefore,

I take issue with the Court's Order and Local Rules designating Council for the Defendant to a superior position in the construction of the Case Management Documents that include scheduling. First, there are no aides, so, I can understand the Court's inclination to assign such a duty to the experienced. But now that there is mutiny in this Court, and apparently, lawyers substitute their judgement for the find of facts judgement.

I cannot deny my disability, I read those words afore written by me, and they result in a description of crazy events.

However, if on equal footing, I would have felt comfortable issuing suggested dates, and more, in fact, I would have done what I always do, build a computer system to manage data. I would have registered autocmecf.com, which would have generated PDF documents to file in this Court's Docket.

In any scheduling of time period with dependencies, I find a GANTT chart as helpful. This chart,



Displays the schedule, percentage of tasks complete, and how the delay impacts court deadlines.



[EncryptedHashOfQRCodeWithElectronicSignatureOfSigner]SERVER LOCATION ID TO JOIN SECURE
SERVER

But I don't know the receptibility here, perhaps the court finds QR Codes insulting and offensive.

But such a barcode would allow the Court to retain authority over signatures and entrances into the
docket. This website would have the intent and purpose of generating PDF files to be submitted.

To make location, linked, these URL, or Universal Resource Locators, could be embedded into the
document at points, and referring to Documents, this would ONLY be for the purpose of document

numbering proposals, proposal documents, basically the formation of disclosure and discovery filings before they are needed.

I find the document on your website malformed in title. "PROPOSED SCHEDULING AND BENCH TRIAL ORDER" but then it has rules of decorum. My only complaint is the title, not the extents or other presentations. Be it as it may be, I would have recommended definitions, and other Case Management aspects. For example, there is no reason someone hasn't prepared. The rules dictate that disclosure and discovery should commence immediately thereafter conference. To start searching at this point, means that no due diligence was made at all.



So say I wanted to link to a file, why isn't a good way to sign to an encrypted representation of the document? Based on sealed/unsealed status, for say example, medical records, would this not solve issues? Now, I as Pro Se, can see that the referenced secret documents/materials are defined and I get that benefit without ever knowing what that definition is.

But my inexperience here is fatal. I cannot honestly tell you what dates apply to the rules, for this case is it needed a timeline for each case defendant? Moreover, depending on the answer there, how is the trial date selected? I mean, just recently, CITI, refused service of process. This is the building the marshals were sent to:

Citi Headquarters as designated by Google Maps,



And the result, was that, despite the party name on the summons, we are going to pretend that a CEO, a Chief Operating Officer, has a personal capacity, there is no such thing as respondeat superior. Not only that, the ATTN means I was serving the officer for an act she did as the officer, despite her name being

nowhere else. Be that as it may, what if it finally was returned good? It is now January, with 21 days and an assured extension of time, one defendant is ~5 months outside the timeframes as another. Now while I am sure this is to ultimately accept service but then argue for a disjoining of the matters, this giving good cause, I am baffled how such a result took so long in a process I have little control over. If refusing upon the format of the designation of the summons, such a determination would only take mere seconds to form. At any rate, why was the Marshalls Service so lax and tolerant on service of process regarding my affairs?

This was good,

**ORDER SETTING DEADLINES FOR FILING OF JOINT
PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER AND FOR RULE 26(f) CONFERENCE**

No motion filed before the scheduling conference relieves the parties from compliance with the terms and provisions of this Order.

While effectively expressing frustration around the matter, this part or element of this Order was quite ineffective. None of this happened. I guess I should have purchased a conference package so that I could host a meeting? L.R. whatever the number, it clearly isn't a rule at all since its command to, as council and officer of this Court, take the lead on these case documents if the plaintiff is pro se.

As the Attorney General put it, they are substituting their judgement for the court practitioners in anticipation that judgement in their favor is assured. Nevermind the exercise of Sovereignty when MISSOURI sent the Summons back as well. How it got from the Secretary of State to a Department of Insurance and Commerce, calling them is not illustrative.

If one were to read, or just peruse, Procedural Due Process Rights of Pro Se Civil Litigants by Julie M. Bradlow, you would get an overall unsettled notion about liberal construction, and a few other scenarios, whereas this Court alters some level of substance merely because a person is not an attorney.

However, if you review the law surrounding the Right of Persons Mentally Ill, most of my Rights are defined by cases surrounding persons committed for being dangerous to small helpless people.

Congress, put it this way,

(1) physical or mental disabilities in no way diminish a person's right to fully participate in all aspects of society, yet many people with physical or mental disabilities have been precluded from doing so because of discrimination; others who have a record of a disability or are regarded as having a disability also have been subjected to discrimination;

(2) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;

(3) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing, public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;

(4) unlike individuals who have experienced discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, religion, or age, individuals who have experienced discrimination on the basis of disability have often had no legal recourse to redress such discrimination;

(5) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser services, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities;

(6) census data, national polls, and other studies have documented that people with disabilities, as a group, occupy an inferior status in our society, and are severely disadvantaged socially, vocationally, economically, and educationally;

(7) the Nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals; and

(8) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and nonproductivity.

But despite all this, this Court has continually stated that a person with an ailment that affects the mind, and have been “*mental disabilities [that] have been precluded [from society]*” still enjoy just as much access to representation as anyone else. The combination of all this has left the development of “mental” disabilities wholly undeveloped.

My sin? I am too retarded to understand how to “state a claim in which relief can be granted”. That’s what every party filed in this case, after denying everything.

WHEREFORE:

JENSEN prays to the God of Natural Law that meaning was conveyed herein.

JENSEN prays for relief to file amended proposed trial order.

JENSEN prays for all relief just and proper.

Sincerely and Respectfully Submitted,

//s/JasonAJensen

Jason A Jensen

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jason A Jensen, did cause all defendants currently present and in appearance of this Court to be served electronically by the ECF/CM of the Federal Court, on this day the 11th of January 2023.

//s/JasonAJensen